IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.3160 OF 2005

Zicom Electronic Security Systems Ltd. .. .. Petitioner
v/s.
The State of Mah. & ors. .. Respondents

Mr.V.R.Dhond with Anupam Dighe i/by India Law Alliance for petitioner.

Ms.Geeta Shastri, AGP for res.Nos.1 to 3.

CORAM : H.L. GOKHALE &
ABHAY S. OKA, JJ.

DATED : 2nd February 2006

P.C. :

1. Heard Mr.Dhond in support of this Petition. Ms.Shastri, AGP appears for respondent Nos.1 to 3.

2. The petitioner makes a grievance with respect to the decision of the respondents to cancel the tenders for the close circuit TV which was sought to be installed in the city of Mumbai. This cancellation has been done on three prior occasions. On the fourth occasion another tender is floated for the same purpose. The petitioner submits that the petitioner has been the lowest offerer every time and for the reasons best known to the respondents, they have cancelled the tender altogether.

3. A reply has been filed by the Joint Secretary of the Government of Maharashtra. He has given the explanation as to why these decisions were taken on earlier occasions. The decisions arrived at on earlier occasions are not under challenge. It is the third decision which is under challenge. It has been stated in the reply that IT field is expanding fast and becoming cheap day by day. It is also stated that the fund made available by the Central Government has lapsed in the meanwhile. We have gone into this aspect only because it is the State which has invited these tenders. In view of this explanation, we are not entertaining this Petition. At the same time, we observe that the Government, if at all, is keen in installing this circuit TV system at the concerned places, it ought to finalise the tenders. Now, the tenders have been invited for the fourth occasion. The petitioner has given its bid and we hope that this time the history does not repeat.

4. Mr.Dhond points out that the grants made available this time will be valid until 31st March 2006. We expect the State Government to take decision expeditiously and to see to it that the

tender process is not required to be cancelled only on the ground that the decision has gone beyond 31st March 2006.

5. Petition disposed of with the above order.

(H.L. GOKHALE, J.)

(ABHAY S. OKA, J.)